THE MONITEUR UNIVERSEL AND ROMANTICISM, 1813-1830

BY

SISTER MARY ANICETA GUYETTE, O.S.F.

A.B., De Paul University, 1923

M.A., De Paul University, 1925

B.S. (Lib.), University of Illinois, 1928

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN FRENCH
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1940

URBANA, ILLINOIS

1940

THE MONITEUR UNIVERSEL AND ROMANTICISM, 1813-1830

BY

SISTER MARY ANICETA GUYETTE, O.S.F.

A.B., De Paul University, 1923

M.A., De Paul University, 1925

B.S. (Lib.), University of Illinois, 1928

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN FRENCH
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1940

URBANA, ILLINOIS

1940

THE MONITEUR UNIVERSEL AND ROMANTICISM

1813-1830

The *Moniteur Universel* [1] is primarily a political paper. It was founded by Charles Panckouke in 1789 for the dissemination of facts and opinions relative to contemporary events. Later it was to serve in an official capacity to chronicle the speeches and debates that took place in the national Assemblies. But Panckouke had determined that it should have additional functions as well. Not only was it to be the repertory of authentic documents concerning foreign and domestic politics: "il devait en outre ouvrir ses colonnes à la critique littéraire, à l'examen des travaux de la science et des productions des arts." [2] Since the periodical press played an important role during the Restoration period, and exercised great influence in forwarding the cause of newer forms of literary and political thought, writers have utilized newspapers and periodicals in studying the various phases in the development of the literature of the period. Hence, the author of this thesis felt that a study of the *Moniteur Universel* would disclose some important literary opinions in regard to the growth of Romanticism. The primary aim of the study is to make available the material which has a bearing on the development of Romanticism from 1813 to 1830. A secondary purpose was to discover the attitude of the publication toward the new movement. In the preparation of the thesis it was necessary for the writer to read all articles of a literary nature in the *Moniteur*, and from them determine the attitude of editors and collaborators.

The work has been divided into chapters, as follows:—1. Foreign Literatures: The Coppet Group (1813-1814); II. Foreign Literatures: German and English Works (1813-1830); III. The Drama; IV. Poetry; V. The Novel; VI. General Articles on Romanticism.

With the publication of Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* a new era began in the field of literature. The scenes which the generation of that period had witnessed in the political revolution

---

[1] *La Gazette Nationale* ou *Le Moniteur Universel*, commencé le 5 mai, 1789, précédé d'une introduction historique contenant un abrégé des états-généraux des Assemblées des notables et des principaux événemens qui ont amené la Révolution. Paris, H. Agasse. (The library of the university of Illinois has a complete set of the *Moniteur Universel*, May 5, 1789 to Dec. 31, 1868.)

[2] Hatin, Eugène, *Histoire de la presse politique et littéraire en France*. Paris, 1860, V. 119.

and subsequent readjustments had aroused in them a strong desire for something new. A yearning for the infinite and the unknown found expression in the indefinite and vague poetry of young writers. These desires also found an outlet in the innovations which were being gradually introduced into the various types of literature, and which the *Moniteur* characterized as "ce malheureux penchant à l'innovation qui égare la pluspart de nos jeunes auteurs." [3] A revolution in ideas was taking place in literature as well as in politics. The *Moniteur* admitted this fact: "il y a une révolution dans notre système littéraire, c' est un fait existant, et dont l'accomplissement est inévitable." [4]

Critics and collaborators were aware of the discontent with classical rules that existed among younger writers. They realized, too, that events were leading to a crisis, that the revolution in literature was but an echo of the revolution in society. "On s'y révolta contre les lois du Parnasse, après s'être révolté contre celles de la société." [5] From the beginning of the period studied, every effort was made on the part of the administration to give an impartial tone to the literary reviews. In fact, the wish of the founder had been that the *Moniteur* should give its messages in literature as well as in politics without prejudice or bias, that it should be "comme un écho qui rend indifféremment les sons." [6] This desire to be impartial is definitely stated by Sauvo, the editor-in-chief of the *Moniteur* during these years, when in a criticism of *l'Homme du Monde,* he declares that the publication is not called upon to dictate the type of theatrical performances the public should enjoy. On the contrary, said the editor, "notre mission est d'enregistrer les jugemens qu'il a portés." [7] When Classicists began to feel that they could not longer disregard the innovations of the Romanticists, they made several efforts to bring about a compromise between the two groups. Dausse, writing for the *Moniteur,* asks: "Des beautés généralement admirées, citées comme des examples, ne deviennent-elles point classiques par cela même?" [8] This was but a subterfuge plainly understood by all. In 1828 when many innovations had been accepted by the majority of writers, and even demanded by theater-goers, one critic of the *Moniteur* declared "que les classi-

[3] *Moniteur,* June 7, 1813.
[4] *Ibid.,* Dec. 28, 1828.
[5] *Ibid.,* May 16, 1822.
[6] Hatin, *op. cit.,* 111.
[7] *Moniteur,* Oct. 31, 1827.
[8] *Ibid.,* Feb. 24, 1824.

ques ne repoussent aucune tentative d'innovation, quand ils y découvrent quelques beautés, même irrégulières." [9] Amar, too, addressing the Romanticists in an article which appeared in the *Moniteur*, admits that there is need of a reform in French literature. "Messieurs," he said, "je conviens avec vous qu'il *nous faut* du nouveau; que nous sommes blasés, et que si quelque stimulant un peu actif ne vient de tems en tems réveiller la paresse de notre goût, il est à craindre que rien ne puisse un jour, nous tirer de notre apathie littéraire." [10] Of the Classicists whom he addresses as "mes bons amis, mes compagnons, mes guides," he inquires whether there were not some means of a reconciliation between the two literary groups. "Ne reste-t-il donc, entre vous et vos adversaires, aucun moyen de conciliation; et quelques concessions mutuelles, ne pourraient-elles pas amener la conclusion d'un traité?" Such a truce would have established a new literary era, not only for France, but for the whole of Europe.

Many critics felt that the flood of incoming foreign literatures, particularly the literatures of England and Germany, was partly to blame for the unrest among French writers. The editors realized that the study of the German language had been neglected for too long a time in France, and spoke of a knowledge of it as being "un véritable soin et le complément nécessaire de toute éducation." [11] On the other hand German philosophy was only "du galimatias métaphysique," [12] and German works should be drawn upon with more reserve. Accordingly, the *Moniteur* issues its warnings early: "Prenons-y garde, les cours de littérature étrangère ont leurs dangers; ils ne doivent être lus qu'avec une grande réserve." [13]

The years 1813 and 1814 produced literary material dealing with Romanticism which forms a distinct unit. This material is the product of the so-called "Coppet Group." The close relationship of Wilhelm Schlegel, Mme de Staël and Sismondi is well known and is frequently commented upon by the *Moniteur*. A powerful influence in the development of new ideas was A. W. Schlegel's *Vorlesungen über Kunst und Literatur*, published in German in 1809, and translated into French by Mme Necker de Saussure in 1813. The publication

[9] *Ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1828.
[10] *Ibid.*, Nov. 28, 1818.
[11] *Ibid.*, Jan. 10, 1829.
[12] *Ibid.*, Nov. 24, 1823.
[13] *Ibid.*, Jan. 14, 1814.

of Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* in 1813 also gave a strong impulse to the study of foreign literature. She had devoted six years to the composition of her work, written for the most part at her chateau in Coppet. Every chapter shows the influence of the Schlegel brothers with whom she had much in common. The work shows how Mme de Staël profited from her contact with the great writers of Germany. The horizon of her ideas had been enlarged, and her acquired knowledge of the German theatre and of German literature in general had broken down her earlier prejudices. *De l'Allemagne* remains as a monument of that period. It revealed to French readers a new world as yet unexplored. In it the author presented the dramatic works of Goethe, Schiller, Wieland and Werner. She praised their dramas and was instrumental in making both German and English writers better known in France. The third important book of this period was *De la Littérature du Midi de l'Europe,* by J. C. L. Sismondi, a Swiss writing in French. This consisted of a series of lectures given at the Academy of Geneva in 1812, whose subject matter was a discussion of several of the foreign literatures of Europe. The work was conceived in a spirit of literary liberalism and cosmopolitanism, under the influence of Mme de Staël.

The influence of the three authors mentioned was far-reaching. Schlegel had introduced Shakespeare to the German people, and thus indirectly prepared the way for him in France. Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* shows his direct influence. In spite of its faults, her work is often considered the first intelligent and sympathetic account of Germany by a foreigner. Sismondi was an able ally in presenting foreign literature to the people of France.

After Schlegel the two great German influences were Goethe and Schiller. Goethe's *Werther* paved the way for much of the "mal du siècle" which the century was later to witness. His *Goetz von Berlichingen* introduced, or rather, aided in the formation of the historical comedy. The year 1820 marks a particularly important date in the discussion of German literary influences, for it was the period in which several of Schiller's plays were adapted to the French stage. The historical drama had come into France to stay, and adaptations of *Maria Stuart, Die Jungfrau von Orleans, Wilhelm Tell, Wallenstein,* and *Die Räuber* became very popular in France. Later Schiller's *Die Braut von Messina* and his *Kabale und Liebe* gave the framework for more adaptations. Political reasons, including dissatisfaction with

the government in France, as well as literary reasons, were the cause of the popularity of Schiller's plays.

As the year 1830 approached, the number of adaptations of Schiller's works began to lessen, although this German author attracted French people more than others of his countrymen. He was for French audiences a Shakespeare with the crudities removed. The exalted philosophy and symbolism of both Goethe and Schiller made little impression on the young Romanticists of the day; for, even in their wildest extravagances, they prided themselves on their instinct for clarity. The chief influence of Goethe and Schiller, as observed by the critics, was in the destruction of the rules. The Romanticists needed these authors as allies. On the other hand acquaintance with German works awakened new vistas of history and romance, and aided in bringing back sentiment and idealism into French literature.

The *Moniteur*, however, did not see the matter in that light. The works of England and Germany are blamed for the many innovations introduced into France. These are characterized as "productions monstrueuses et bizarres," and dramatic art has almost been destroyed "grâce à l'empirisme meurtrier des docteurs de la nouvelle école." [14] The Romanticists had declared in their manifestos that they were about to create marvels of literary perfection. But what have they produced? inquired the critic. "Ils n'ont encore inventé et crée que Shakespeare, Goethe, et Schiller." [15] Schiller's *Die Räuber*, especially, was blamed for the decadence of French tragedy. It was considered "le type réel et complet du mélodrame, qui parmi nous a tué la tragédie." [16]

The *Moniteur* feared that these borrowings from foreign literatures would effect a change in the national character of France's literature, because the forms and nuances common to the language of neighboring peoples are foreign to the French language. They are not capable of being blended into the national character, and the *Moniteur* felt that they "produisent un mélange bizarre et monstrueux, dont les yeux ne sont pas moins blessés que la raison. Ces discordances morales ne tardent pas à devenir des contrastes choquans en littérature; et tout retombe insensiblement dans le chaos." [17]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1828.
[15] *Ibid.*, Nov. 12, 1829.
[16] *Ibid.*, June 11, 1830.
[17] *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1823.

In regard to Shakespeare, this "dieu du théâtre" of the Romanticists, the *Moniteur* is no less severe. With him "le commerce est dangereux," [18] and authors are cautioned not to imitate him. It would be a misfortune for France to bring the English tragedy with its "inconcevables irrégularités" to the French stage, because the style of the English poet "est habituellement entaché du plus mauvais goût et de la recherche la plus extravagante." [19] That the *Moniteur* was decidedly unfavorable to the imitation of Shakespeare and to the introduction of his works into France is shown by the following quotation: "Rien ne serait plus fatal à notre langue, que si nos écrivains, entraînés à l'imitation des idiomes du Nord, transportaient la phraséologie de ces derniers dans la nôtre." [20]

In spite of the frequent admonitions of the *Moniteur* and other papers to their readers not to permit themselves to be influenced by foreign works, the English troupe of actors which visited France in 1827 was well received. Gradually but surely the public had been prepared for this appreciation of Shakespeare's works. In the earlier years of this period studied the public had been repeatedly warned against Shakespearean tragedy, because "il offre des défauts trop nombreux pour que le goût le plus pur puisse répondre de les éviter." [21] From time to time other reasons were brought forward in an endeavor to prove that Shakespeare should not be tolerated on the French stage. How could French men of letters, accustomed to established rules for literature, endure "ce mélange de prose, de vers blancs, et de vers rimés, . . . l'obscurité qui couvrent quelquefois ses pensées, la bassesse du language, les équivoques de quelques-uns de ses personnages, le style ampoulé de quelques autres, leur manie de courir après l'esprit et les antithèses dans les moments les plus passionnés?" [22] *Hamlet* was considered "un mélodrame primitif;" Vigny's translation of *Othello*, "en étrangetés versifiés," ought at least to have been made conformable "à nos usages et à nos moeurs;" and a translation of the *Merchant of Venice* which appeared about this time, was termed "un conte de fées."

Previous to 1827 and the Shakespearean performances of the English troupe in Paris during that year, the great English dramatist

[18] *Ibid.*, Oct. 23, 1823.
[19] *Ibid.*, Sept. 17, 1827.
[20] *Ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1827.
[21] *Ibid.*, Mar. 23, 1814.
[22] *Ibid.*, Feb. 4, 1814.

had been known in France largely through the reputation given him by Voltaire. Upon his return from England after a period of banishment by the French government, the French philosopher had characterized Shakespeare as "barbare" and had declared that the English tragedy "ne serait pas supportée par la plus vile populace de France et d'Italie." In 1827 the critic finds a great change in the attitude of French audiences. "Paris a porté un jugement très-sain sur l'ouvrage, sur le génie de son auteur, sur le tems où il écrivait, sur les beautés hardies, sur les défauts inséparables d'une liberté si illimitée. Il ne s'est pas montré effrayé du monstre; il n'en a pas repoussé l'image: mais il est demeuré bien loin d'y trouver un modèle accompli." [23] The attitude of the *Moniteur* is apparently in accord with that of French audiences, although the critic remarked that at some of the performances "les admirables parties" were well received by the audiences, and other parts were patiently endured. The public appeared to be "profondément convaincu que le génie ne brille jamais de plus d'éclat que lorsqu'il se soumet lui-même à de rigoureuses et salutaires entraves." [24]

That the *Moniteur Universel* was not altogether unfavorable to Shakespeare and his works is shown in various reviews of parodies which appeared at intervals in the publication. Shakespeare is the "géant anglais, réduit aux plus minimes proportions;" [25] the parodists are "ces apprentis arrangeurs."

Although many of the reviews are decidedly unfavorable to "les belles monstruosités de Shakespeare, d' Otway, et de Rowe," [26] it is noticeable that as the years go by, critics of the *Moniteur* show a tendency to be more liberal in their views in regard to imitations of Shakespeare and other English authors. The statement applies especially to Byron, "ce chantre du mal." In the early years of this period the *Moniteur* refused to pass judgment on him and his works. But in 1825 in a notice concerning some of the poet's works, the critics declared that the place of the young poet in literature had not yet been decided. "Sa renommé gigantesque, pyramidale, est encore en pleine ébullition: laissons le tems faire son office: nous en parlerons dans quelques années." [27]

---

[23] *Ibid.*, Sept. 17, 1827.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Ibid.*, Feb. 4, 1814.
[26] *Ibid.*, Mar. 3, 1830.
[27] *Ibid.*, Oct. 5, 1825.

The records of the *Moniteur Universel* show how strongly Shakespeare was condemned up to the time of the arrival of the English troupe in 1827. The minds of the people had been slowly but surely absorbing the theories and doctrines of the Romantic school. The young Romanticists had urged that Shakespeare be studied. They went further than that. They not only studied but proceeded to borrow scenes and motifs from certain favorite productions. They claimed the right to disregard the unities. They announced early their intention of creating men, not stage-characters. This they proposed to do by allowing each character to speak his own language. They learned to introduce ordinary characters in their dramas, to fill the stage with silent characters, and to change the scenery. They strove for truth to life, for reality, — the result was the fusion of tragedy and comedy.

The influence of Scott was not very strongly felt until about 1825. Up to that time he had been composing his novels and "transportant tour à tour le roman dans l'histoire et l'histoire dans le roman." [28] *Rob Roy, Ivanhoe, The Abbot, The Monastery,* and *Guy Mannering* were offered in quick succession to satisfy the curiosity of his readers. These were translated into French almost as soon as they were published, and served as sources for the historical drama which was then becoming a favorite with French audiences.

Scott's popularity in France was not a temporary affair, but was sustained during many years. Judging from the works imitated from his novels, he made more of an impression upon the young Romanticists than did even Byron. The melodramatists preferred Scott as a writer of melodramatic tales, but the Romantic playwrights preferred the patient collector of mediaeval lore, of ancient ballads, of stories of the supernatural, and the mass of picturesque details which Scott wove into the highly imaginative romances that captivated continental Europe during this period. *Le Chateau de Kenilworth,* by Scribe and Molesville, *La Dame Blanche,* by Scribe and Boieldieu, *Ivanhoë,* by Léon de Wailly and Eugène Deschamps, *Louis IX à Peronne, . . .* imité de *Quentin Durward,* by Mely Jeannin, *Lancastre,* by D'Epagny and others were some of the historical dramas imitated or adapted from the novels of Walter Scott, and spoken of by the *Moniteur Universel.*

---

[28] *Ibid.,* Sept. 26, 1825.

The *Bataille d'Hernani* has come to be regarded by many as the decisive blow in the struggle for Romantic supremacy. It was, in reality, only a sort of climax in a long-continued struggle. Hence, it is useful to consider the work of the pioneers, whose work is almost forgotten now, but who in their day were hated by the Classicists as revolutionaries. The intrinsic value of their plays is slight; nevertheless, they derived considerable momentum from the mere weight of numbers and by mere force of persistence. The *Moniteur Universel*, being primarily a political paper, was most conservative in the expression of its opinions, and in its attitude toward "la nouvelle école." "Il continua à enregistrer, comme par le passé avec le même sang-froid, les actes du gouvernement. Le *Moniteur*, disait-on alors non sans raison, n'est pas un journal de discussion; c'est un poteau sur lequel les ministères placardent les actes officiels." [29] Before 1813 nothing of much importance had been done, but even as early as 1809 journalists had pointed out the defection of some of the younger writers from the standards of Classicism. Writers were divided into two camps, — the Classicists who were still strong in their influence on literature and art, and the Romanticists who were striving to acquire supremacy in that field. A failure for the one group was always a success for the other. The historical drama, like the historical novel, continued to find favor with the populace, as did the "drame biographique," the idea of which was borrowed from the Germans. Subjects relating to the early history of France, found in the old chronicles, formed the nucleus for the plots of *Le Duc de Bourgogne, Clovis, Frédégonde, Brunehault,* by Népomucène Lemercier. Ancient history furnished the material for dramas like *Clytemnestre,* by Alexandre Soumet, and *Léonidas,* by Pichat. Other historical dramas were *Attila,* by Hippolyte Bis, *Pierre de Portugal,* by Arnault, *Le Cid d'Andalousie,* by Charles Lebrun, *Cromwell,* by Victor Hugo, *Henri III,* by Alexandre Dumas, *Christine, ou Stockholm, Fontainebleau et Rome,* also by Dumas.

All of these tragedies failed in one way or another to observe classical rules, and the critics of the *Moniteur* saw in the Romanticists writers who aimed to destroy without the ability to build up. They felt it their duty "de démontrer le danger d'un système qui nous est donné pour un perfectionnement, et qui n'est évidemment qu'un pas

[29] Avenal, Henri, *Histoire de la Presse française depuis* 1789 *jusqu'à nos jours.* Paris, 1900, p. 310.

rétrograde." [30] The "genre bâtard" that threatened to supplant the regular tragedy "n'a besoin d'être ni tragédie, ni comédie, mais qu'il peut participer à toutes les deux." [31] Critics felt that Romantic plays had a pernicious influence on the populace because they tended to lessen morality and respect for law. "Nous voyons une foule de pièces de théâtre bien inférieures pour la forme et le fond à celles d'Euripide, mais qui leur ressemblent en ce point qu'elles amollissent les âmes par des émotions douces et corruptrices, et que leur tendance générale est de produire des incrédules en moralité." [32] The *Moniteur* felt that if Romanticism were to gain the ascendancy in literature and the arts, the superiority of French literature over other European literatures would be lost. If French talent is to be devoted to the new system, authors would wish to go farther and would endeavor "nous enlever jusqu'aux principes: semblables à certaines théories très-funestes, qui ont pour but d'anéantir la conscience même, lorsque les vertus sont anéanties." [33] The idea of retrogression instead of progress in letters and art was voiced many times in the columns of the *Moniteur*. "On remonte à la barbarie, on siffle Boileau, on détrône Racine, on efface deux siècles de gloire, on refait l'esprit humain, c'est-à-dire, on le ramène à la defformité." [34]

The decisive day of the battle was, of course, that of the performance of *Hernani*. Great importance is often attached to the picturesqueness of the performance, and not sufficient attention is given to the preparation for it and the results which followed it.

The *Moniteur*, however, followed the development of *Hernani* from the day Victor Hugo handed the manuscript to Baron Taylor, who was chairman of the committee for receiving plays for the Théâtre Français, to the time of the famous performance. But here the conservative *Moniteur* stopped. Excerpts from newspapers criticisms of the play were freely quoted by the publication, in order to give, as the critic says, an idea of the prevailing opinion of the play. Quotations were printed from the following papers: the *Gazette de France*, the *Constitutionnel*, the *Journal des Débats*, the *Globe*, the *Temps*, the *Courier des Tribuneaux*, the *Drapeau Blanc*, the *Messager des Chambers*, the *Courier-Français*, the *Universel*, and the *Journal*

[30] *Ibid.*, Nov. 28, 1813.
[31] *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1824.
[32] *Ibid.*, Jan. 10, 1814.
[33] *Ibid.*, May 16, 1822.
[34] *Ibid.*, Apr. 5, 1830.

du Commerce. No particular papers were directly hostile. Some, like the *Globe* and the *Journal des Débats* openly sided with the Romanticists and were enthusiastic in their praise. The *Moniteur* made no definite pronouncements on the further success or failure of the play, merely announcing the performances, or giving short criticisms of the parodies which immediately sprang into existence. From a climactic point of view it is disappointing that the *Moniteur* says nothing original about the work on which so much interest was centered. True to its policy of being but an echo of passing events, it is satisfied with merely quoting the opinions of other journalists.

The influences that were perceptible in the drama and in the novel also affected poetry; and although politics seems to have imposed a painful silence on the French Muses during this period, from time to time some courageous voice was raised, as though to announce that not all hope was lost for literature.

Lamartine's *Méditations* in 1820 and his *Nouvelles Méditations* in 1823 seemed to supply a need that belonged peculiarly to the generation of that period, for in the words of the *Moniteur's* critic, Lamartine was "le peintre éloquent de quelques-unes des poignantes impressions de ce siècle." When the *Harmonies Poétiques et Religieuses* appeared Amar characterizes it as "poésie vaporeuse, et pour ainsi dire aërienne, légère et fantastique comme les objets qu'elle décrit."[35]

Hugo's *Odes et Ballades* brought forth some words of praise from the *Moniteur.* The style of the poet is energetic and animated and full of warmth, "mais on regrette souvent que le goût, la correction et l'élégance lui semblent l'apanage de la médiocrité." [36] But the *Moniteur* concedes that Hugo had real talent: "Son astre l'a créé poète." Besides these great poets of the Romantic period discussed in the *Moniteur* there were authors of less importance whose works were also reviewed. Among these were some who devoted themselves to the "genre troubadour," which style of poetry was the fashion during this period. This type of poetry is significant, for in it we find the culmination of an antiquarian movement to which Percy's *Reliques* belongs in England. It did not assume the same proportions as the latter, but this may be due to the fact that it was appropriated by the aristocracy, whether of 1780 or 1816, and hence, suspect to the nation at large.

[35] *Ibid.,* July 18, 1830.
[36] *Ibid.,* Dec. 4, 1828.

Under the Consulate and the Empire the "goût troubadour" reached its highest peak of popularity. It appeared in art, and the Greeks and Romans of David were crowded out of the Salons by Pilgrims and Crusaders. It appeared in the theater; no melodrama would venture to omit the serenade to the heroine.

Under the influence of England and Germany, the spirit of the ballads changed once more. The poems were less lyrical; they are not a plaint but a story, of the same type as the English ballad. A transition toward Scott-worship was taking place. The romances of mystery and terror soon appeared, affected partly by Ann Radcliffe and "Monk" Lewis, and still more by Bürger; paladins, troubadours, and chatelaines gave way to hermits, ruins, specters and graveyards, and all the other accessories beloved by the early Romanticists.

All this was but a superficial mediaevalism, but serious research was being done by some who paved the way for the later Romantic historians. Raynouard had been assembling material for his monumental work on the poetry of Languedoc and Provence; [37] Creuzé de Lesser provided a still richer mine with his *Chevaliers de la Table Ronde*,[38] and his *Amadis de Gaule*.[39] Another work of vast importance was Marchangy's *La Gaule Poétique*, the first two volumes of which were published in 1813, and the third and fourth volumes two years later. This return to national origins, this appeal to the patriotic sentiment of the artist corresponded to the doctrines of the German Romanticists. In another work, *Tristan, ou la France au Quatorizième Siècle*, Marchangy gave evidence of being a historian and a moralist. No doubt he wanted to preserve from the ravages of time the popular beliefs, practices and legends, and all that could serve to reconstruct the life of primitive France. But he wanted more, — and the importance of the historical aim disappears before the moral aim. If the Fatherland is, as the name implies, the land of ancestors, nothing can contribute more powerfully to a love of the Fatherland than to discover the social institutions which those ancestors built up, as well as the wisdom of their customs and practices.

Édouard Englemont, influenced by the success of Marchangy's works, published his *Légendes Francaises*, which narrated historic

[37] *Ibid.*, Aug. 13, 1813.
[38] *Ibid.*, Mar. 16, 1813.
[39] *Ibid.*, July 5, 1813.

events rather than events of the imagination. For this reason critics placed the author in the class of poets "peintres" or "historiens."

Another work of the same type was the *Orléanide* of Lebrun de Charmettes. This work which required fourteen years of research and labor, furnished another rich source of information on the early history of France, as well as a host of subjects for both the tragedy and the epic.

An author of these early years who approaches more nearly the later Romanticists than did his contemporaries was the Vicomte d'Arlincourt. His earliest poem reviewed in the *Moniteur* was *Charlemagne*, ou *La Caroléide*, an epic poem in twenty-four parts. The object of the work was to show the slow but sure advance of civilization over barbarism.

Baour-Lormian, Millevoye, and other poets formed the subject matter of several reviews. In all of the poetry, the *Moniteur* condemns "cet étalage de sensibilité qui revient à chaque instant, et qui n'est pas toujours exempt d'affectation." [40] The sadness and melancholy which permeate so many works of the Romanticists are the subject of frequent criticism. "Le vague, la mélancholie, l'inquiétude du coeur, l'incertitude d'un esprit qui ne se fixe sur rien, un mélange de sentiment tour à tour religieux et profane sont les ressorts qu'ils font mouvoir pour attendrir et arracher des larmes." [41]

In general, Romanticism as such, was censured and condemned from the very beginning of this period under consideration. To the Classicists, the work of the young Romanticists was an "oeuvre de confusion," a "non-sens en littérature," and a "contre-sens en politique." The new school was a revolt against traditions that were centuries old. It was more than that: "C'est du dérèglement; c'est de la révolte; c'est la raison *individuelle* se mettant à la place de la raison suprême; c'est tout ce qu'on veut, excepté de l'ordre et du génie." [42]

Schlegel had criticized the French tradition of adherence to the classical unities. Mme de Staël, too, believed that the unity of action alone was worthy of consideration. Hugo's famous preface condemned all rules. "Il n'y a ni règles, ni modèles," he had written. And in general, the *Moniteur* felt that for the Romanticists "tout ce

[40] *Ibid.*, Feb. 13, 1824.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] *Ibid.*, Apr. 5, 1830.

qui est règle est gêne." The rule of the unities was thought of as useless and worthless. The so-called reformers "les ont traitées d'inutilités, de routine stupide, d'entraves nuisibles au génie, et qui ont mis et mettent encore tout en oeuvre pour en débarrasser l'esprit humain." [43]

As the year 1830 approached the *Moniteur* realized that further struggle was useless. Adherents of the classical traditions admitted that Classicism was weakening, and that the new school would predominate. [44] "Que voulez-vous faire d'une littérature qui finit? D'autre part, qu'est-ce qu'une littérature qui s' annonce par la théorie *du laid, du difforme, du monstrueux?*" In the early years the cry of "Guerre, guerre aux barbares!" had been frequently heard from the partisans of the Classical school. Later on efforts towards a reconciliation of the two groups were made by the Classicists themselves. But the reconciliation was never effected, neither were there concessions made on either side. Consequently, for years the traditionalists continued to fight for "le trône d'Homère, fondé sur les siècles."

In 1825 the *Moniteur* had resolved never to leave the path indicated by classical rules:

> O, nous conserverons, intacte et révérée,
> La charte des bons vers, par Despréaux jurée,

but by 1830 it faced the inevitable. Further resistance was useless.

This study closes with the year 1830. Many of the greater works of the Romanticists appeared after that date. The author feels that in the period treated by this study, the efforts of the *Moniteur* to be strictly impartial were not successful. It is clear that its point of view was conservative and classical throughout.

---

[43] *Ibid.*, Apr. 30, 1822.
[44] *Ibid.*

VITA

The author was born in Superior, Wisconsin, November 22, 1888. She received her elementary education at Saint Joseph's School, Superior, and her secondary education at Saint Francis Academy, Joliet, Illinois. She entered the Congregation of the Third Ordor of Saint Francis of Mary Immaculate, Joliet, after which she completed her Normal Training at Saint Francis Normal School.

She taught in the elementary schools of the Congregation for ten years. Then she was appointed teacher-librarian at the Academy in Joliet. During this time she attended De Paul and Loyola Universities in Chicago, receiving from De Paul University the A.B. degree in 1923 and the A.M. degree two years later. During the summers of 1924-1927, she was a student at the University of Illinois Library School, receiving the degree of B.S. in Library Science in 1928.

She held the position of Dean of Students at the College of Saint Francis from 1930-1932. The following term she attended the Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. The year 1933-1934 she spent in foreign travel and study in Italy and France, receiving from the Sorbonne the diploma for the Cours de Préparation des Professeurs de Français à l'Étranger and the Certificate from the Institut de Phonétique.

In 1935 she entered the University of Illinois as a Graduate Student in the department of Romance Languages. From 1935-1939 she continued her work through the Master's to the Doctor's degree while holding an instructorship in the French Department at the College of Saint Francis, Joliet, teaching there during the summers of 1936, 1937, and 1939.